June 5, 1975

Honorable Frank Church
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.

Dear Senator Church:

COPY

While I believe there are inherent credibility problems in what I am writing you about, I also assume it is one of a large number of rumors and reports about the JFK assassination with which you are being inundated and that what I can tell you about it may be helpful.

In today's mail there is this anonymous note:

> "If you subpoena records of the estate of Dorothy Kilgallen (deceased) in New York, you will find certain clues concerning the JFK death. The CIA and FBI have confiscated certain documents relating to the estate of Dorothy Kilgallen. Please be very careful."

Dorothy Kilgallen did have a private interview with Jack Ruby during his trial and in the judge's chambers. Irregular as it was, this apparently did happen.

Shortly after her death, attributed to a combination of alcohol and barbituates, the make-up man of a New York TV show on which I appeared told me he had been her make-up man and that she had told him she would break the JFK assassination wide open in five days. She died first. He had no details.

Not long after that I was part of a panel show on the same station. Another participant, Penn Jones, Jr., of Midlothian, Texas, had an interest in seemingly mysterious deaths. I had not met Jones before that occasion. I then told him the foregoing story so he could follow it up. This began what may well be no more than a mythology about her death, with inferences of foul deeds.

I have no evidence either way. Life does abound in coincidences.

However, what is unusual is that with this exclusive interview nothing ever appeared in the press and no notes or tapes have ever surfaced. Others, some for me, have tried to obtain these from her husband. It is my recollection that he said there were none. I cannot imagine an interview as newsworthy as that one in which an experienced reporter made no record of any kind.

In my belief, Ruby was not rational. So, even though I have no way of knowing what he may have said, without independent confirmation there would be no credibility.

I do know that the investigation as it relates to Ruby was entirely inadequate. There is what I regard as a fake FBI report dealing with Ruby as an informant for the House Un-American committee as of the time of Mr. Nixon's membership on it. There is also a letter from J. Edgar Hoover supposedly recounting the unproductiveness of

the admitted attempt to recruit Ruby as a criminal informant in Dallas. I have both. I also know there is another version, given me by a former Dallas FBI agent. It is that Ruby was recruited, by an agent other than the one mentioned by Hoover.

All that appears to be dependable that we know about Ruby is inconsistent with the Hoover letter. Ruby was a police buff, despite his career. He should have been a likely and a productive source of criminal information. His club was ideally suited to this end.

The 207 zip cancellation on the anonymous note is one from which I have never received any communication like this one. It is within easy commuting distance of the federal agencies.

Unless the writer meant to subpoena the supposed records from these agencies, there is an obvious contradiction between suggesting a subpoena (to me yet!) and alleging that they were confiscated.

However, I believe that it might be useful to make a request of both the husband and the agencies.

As the allegation that Dorothy Kilgallen was murdered lacks basis for belief, so also does Hoover's explanation. It seems quite improbable that any reporter would have come from such an interview without notes or a tape. If any records are found, it ought not be impossible to determine whether they are worth following up or if they reflect the reasonable. The one purpose Ruby's bullet served was to make a trial and a defense impossible. He had more opportunities to shoot Oswald after Oswald's arrest than the one he used. He was well-known to the Dallas police, who were well aware of his record and his tendency toward violence. There was never any real investigation of how it was possible for him to be where he was when he did shoot Oswald. The only effort was to dismiss suspicions that he conspired. And I find no innocent explanatin for his presence in areas prohibited to all but officials and identified members of the press when he was as well known to the police as he was and lacked any credentials for those who did not know him.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

COPY